

App. No.: 10/605843
Filed: October 30, 2003
Conf. No.: 2842

Page 5 of 6

REMARKS

As is noted above, this amendment is not submitted in response to the Final Rejection, dated September 22, 2005, and applicants' attorney would like to explain why it was not submitted earlier and why the copying of Claim 1 from US Letters Patent 6,786,212 was not done for more than one year after the issuance of that patent.

The Choi Patent 6,786,212 was cited in the first Office Action in this case but was not applied against any claim hereof. However it was relied upon in another related application of the assignee hereof that has a later filing date than this application. In reviewing it and its claims in that other application the undersigned realized that at least claim 1 of the Choi Patent was supported by the disclosure of this case and in fact both this case and Choi claim the same invention.

The undersigned then contacted the Assignee hereof through Japanese counsel and was authorized to provoke an interference. In preparation for that action the undersigned checked the PARE records to determine the status of the Amendment filed by Fax on March 20, 2005 and found that that amendment was not shown in the record of this case. Therefore it was resubmitted on August 2, 2005 with a request how to reconcile this. The undersigned continued to monitor the status in PARE and first found the letter of August 2, 2005 in the file at the same time the Final Rejection was mailed and thus was unable to file the copying amendment until after that date.

The claim has been copied exactly as claim 18 and thus conforms to the suggested count. It is also submitted that claims 2, 8 and 9 of the Choi Patent also correspond to the count although there is an error in Choi claim 8 since there is no antecedent basis for the recitation of the CPS.

Claim 18 (Choi Claim 1) is set out below to show how it is supported by the disclosure herein.

Claim 18 (Annotated) A method for preventing a reverse rotation of an engine, comprising: determining if a predetermined monitoring condition for monitoring a reverse rotation of the engine is satisfied (Choi lists each of the following as predetermined monitoring conditions at Column 4, line 59 through Column 5, line 33. These include normal operation of the crank position sensor which must occur at step S3 for applicants' system to prevent reverse rotation as seen in FIG. 4). Choi next determines if an operation of a starter motor has stopped, when the monitoring condition is satisfied. This is inherent in applicants system which operates either with a pull starter or a starter motor by determining that a pulse output at the point of time T2 as described in applicants paragraph [0020]. Choi then determines if the reverse rotation of the engine is occurring, when the operation of the starter motor has stopped. This is determined in applicants system at the step S4 shown in FIG. 4. If this occurs Choi stops an operation of the engine by stopping at least one of fuel injection and ignition of the engine

App. No.: 10/605843
Filed: October 30, 2003
Conf. No.: 2842

Page 6 of 6

when the reverse rotation of the engine is occurring. Applicant does exactly this as seen at Steps S5 and S6 in FIG. 4.

Thus it is submitted that there is an interference in fact and the declaration of same and the suspension of the time for responding to the Final Rejection, dated September 22, 2005 is most respectfully requested.

A credit card authorization for the claims added by this amendment over those previously paid for is attached.

Respectfully submitted:



Ernest A. Beutler
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 721-1182
Pacific Time

Attachment: Credit Card Authorization